



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,626	10/16/2001	Peter Melchior	027392-000410US	7032
20350 7590 03/11/2011 KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				
EXAMINER				
FISHER, PAUL R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3689				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/11/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Docket@kilpatricktownsend.com
ipefiling@kilpatricktownsend.com
jlhice@kilpatrick.foundationip.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 09/981,626	Applicant(s) MELCHIOR ET AL.
Examiner PAUL FISHER	Art Unit 3689

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 March 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): None.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement(s)*. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Dennis Ruhl/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3689

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejections in the final rejection for the following reasons.

In response to the applicant's argument that Cornelius is directed to a second type of user and is not in relation to the end user. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The recited passage of Cornelius Col. 75-76 is stating one example of where the process can be used but is not the only example. Specifically Col. 76, lines 1-20 talk about the assignment of cases to specific roles and to individuals and assigning priority. While this can be used in other environment as suggested by the reference it is not limited to only those examples since it clearly deals with cases and assigning those cases.

In response to the applicant's argument that, read/write/delete/modify rights are only to developers and not end users of the system, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Again the passage is giving an example and is in no way limiting the reference. Rather it states that a common way to handle security is to group users. Those showing that different groups have different access rights. Col. 96, lines 20-34 again list an example that could obviously be used in different aspects of the invention and is no way limited to simply the example given.

Further as stated in the last office action Cornelius teaches Col. 75, line 26 thru col. 76, line 20; teaches a workflow management which sets forth which tasks exist, what roles exist, which roles can perform which tasks, and which individuals can fill which roles. Col. 81, lines 49-55; teach that access control functions, the common technique of grouping users and assigning different access rights to the different groups, wherein each of these groups is assigned specific read/write/delete/modify authority. Col. 96, lines 20-34; teach a role-based access control establishes access rights and profiles based on job functions within the environment. Col. 34, lines 38-45; disclose that the users can be identified and the agreement made based on this identification, the user specifically is authenticated using a password, which entitles the user to use the system. These passages are not merely directed toward a negotiation of terms and authentication as suggested by the applicant. Rather as shown above these portions of the Cornelius specifically state it is known to set up "which roles exist", "Which roles can perform which tasks", "Which individuals can fill which roles" and the "Re-assignment of cases", which clearly show that different users have different roles and those roles correspond to different rights and access in the system. When combined with Barnes it shows that this type of user access and rights management can be applied to various fields including those pertaining to purchase order agreement. The Examiner asserts that when combined as done in the above rejection the references read over the claims as currently written, therefore the rejections have been maintained.

In response to the applicant's argument that, "One of skill in the art also would have no reason to make such a modification to Cornelius," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in Cornelius the user would want to use these types of techniques where security is a concern, which is clearly the case in business transactions. From this the Examiner asserts that one having ordinary skill would have found it obvious to apply these techniques to any workflow process which security and multiple users are involved, since as stated in Cornelius it is a common technique to assign different groups different rights. From the above the Examiner asserts that the references when combined read over the claims as currently written and the rejections have therefore been maintained.